arXiv:1606.01317v2 [math.DS] 27 Oct 2016

ALLOWED PATTERNS OF SYMMETRIC TENT MAPS VIA COMMUTER FUNCTIONS

KASSIE ARCHER AND SCOTT M. LALONDE

Abstract. We introduce a new technique to study pattern avoidance in dynamical systems, namely the use of a commuter function between non-conjugate dynamical systems. We investigate the properties of such a commuter function, specifically $h : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ satisfying $T_1 \circ h = h \circ T_\mu$, where T_μ denotes a symmetric tent map of height μ. We make use of this commuter function to prove strict inclusion of the set of allowed patterns of T_μ in the set of allowed patterns of T_1.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{S}_n$ denote the set of permutations of $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. We always write permutations in one-line notation: if $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n$, we write

$$\pi = \pi_1\pi_2 \ldots \pi_n.$$

Given a one-dimensional discrete dynamical system $f : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ and a positive integer n, we can associate permutations of length n to certain points of $[0, 1]$ as follows. Let $x \in [0, 1]$, and assume x is not a k-periodic point for any $k < n$. Define $\mathrm{Pat}(x, f, n)$ to be the permutation $\pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_n \in \mathcal{S}_n$ whose entries are in the same relative order as the first n elements of the orbit of x with respect to f. That is, $\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_n$ are in the same relative order as

$$x, f(x), f^2(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x).$$

We call $\mathrm{Pat}(x, f, n)$ the *ordinal pattern*, or simply *pattern*, of x with respect to f of length n.

Example 1.1. The pattern of 0.23 with respect to the standard tent map, T, of length 5 is the permutation of length 5 in the same relative order as

$$0.23, T(0.23), T^2(0.23), T^3(0.23), T^4(0.23)$$

which when evaluated, gives:

$$0.23, 0.46, 0.92, 0.16, 0.32.$$

Therefore, the pattern is $\mathrm{Pat}(0.23, T, 5) = 24513$.

We call the set of all such patterns realized by elements of $[0, 1]$ the *allowed patterns* of f, denoted by $\mathrm{Allow}(f)$. The set of allowed patterns of f of length n is denoted by $\mathrm{Allow}_n(f)$. Any permutation which is not realized as an allowed pattern of f is called a *forbidden pattern* of f. For example, the permutation

Date: October 28, 2016.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A05, 37E05 (primary) and 37E15 (secondary).
Key words and phrases. Allowed pattern, forbidden pattern, tent map, commuter function.

$321 \in \mathcal{S}_3$ is a forbidden pattern of T since there is no $x \in [0,1]$ for which the sequence $x, T(x), T^2(x)$ is in decreasing order.

The allowed and forbidden patterns of many maps from dynamical systems have been studied during the last several years, including the left shift on words [9, 15], signed shifts on the unit interval [1, 2, 6, 7], beta shifts [11], negative beta-shifts [13] and the logistic maps [12].

It is known that for a piecewise monotone map $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$, the size of $\text{Allow}_n(f)$ grows at most exponentially [8], and thus f has forbidden patterns (since the size of $\mathcal{S}_n$ grows super-exponentially). Forbidden patterns of such maps allow one to distinguish a random time series from a deterministic one [3, 4, 5]. This occurs since most patterns are forbidden in a deterministic time series, while a random time series eventually contains all patterns. In addition, the size of $|\text{Allow}_n(f)|$ for a given f is known to be directly related to the topological entropy of f, which measures the complexity of f [8]. Furthermore, these ideas have also led to purely combinatorial results in the study of permutations [7, 9, 10].

For the reasons described above, studying the allowed and forbidden patterns of a given map f presents an interesting problem. In [6], the patterns realized by the standard tent map, T, are characterized and partially enumerated. Here, we study the relationship between the allowed and forbidden patterns of an arbitrary symmetric tent map and those of the standard one. Given $\mu > 0$, we define the *symmetric tent map* of height μ to be the piecewise linear function

$$T_\mu(x) = \begin{cases} 2\mu x & \text{if } 0 \le x \le 1/2 \\ 2\mu(1-x) & \text{if } 1/2 < x \le 1. \end{cases}$$

This gives us a one-parameter family of discrete dynamical systems on the interval $[0,1]$. The tent maps $T = T_1$ and $T_{3/4}$ are depicted below.



FIGURE 1. The first three iterates of the standard tent map T (left) and $T_{3/4}$ (right), together with the line $y = x$. The tent maps themselves are depicted in bold. Notice that for x near $1/2$, $\text{Pat}(x, T, 4) = 3412$. On the other hand, $\text{Pat}(x, T_{3/4}, 4) = 2413$ for x sufficiently close to $1/2$. In fact, one can easily observe from the figure that the pattern 3412 is forbidden for $T_{3/4}$.

We refer to the special case T_1 as the *standard* or *full tent map*, and we denote it simply by T. We also restrict our investigation to the situation where $1/2 < \mu \leq 1$, since the dynamics of T_μ are fairly degenerate when $\mu \leq 1/2$. For example, T_μ has an attracting fixed point if $\mu < 1/2$. Also, $T_{1/2}$ has a continuum of fixed points.

As mentioned above, we aim to analyze the relationship between the allowed patterns of a tent map T_μ for $\mu < 1$ and the allowed patterns of the standard tent map T. One can already see from Figure 1 that $T_{3/4}$ has less complex dynamics than T, and fewer allowed patterns. In particular, $2341, 3412, 3124 \in \text{Allow}(T)$, but these patterns are all forbidden for $T_{3/4}$. On the other hand, it is straightforward to check that all patterns in $\text{Allow}_4(T_{3/4})$ are realized by T. It thus seems plausible to conjecture that $\text{Allow}(T_\mu) \subseteq \text{Allow}(T)$ whenever $1/2 < \mu \leq 1$.

One of the main results of this paper is a proof of the above conjecture. We prove it by constructing a strictly increasing (but not necessarily surjective or continuous) map $h_\mu : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ satisfying

$$T \circ h_\mu = h_\mu \circ T_\mu. \tag{1}$$

We will often refer to (1) as the *commutation relation*. Functions of this type have been studied in [16], where they are called *commuters*. In that paper, the authors describe methods for constructing commuters, and they develop a particularly nice iterative process for building a conjugacy between an asymmetric tent map and a symmetric one. These functions usually look quite bizarre, since they exhibit a certain kind of self-similar structure by construction.

The iterative process used in [16] to construct conjugacies can be easily adapted to build a non-homeomorphic commuter between T_μ and T. We construct such a function and analyze its properties; in particular, we show that the points of discontinuity are dense in $[0,1]$, and that h is strictly increasing. We investigate the range of h (which we believe to be a Cantor-like set), and we then study the implications for patterns realized by the tent maps T_μ and T.

In Section 2, we define commuter functions and prove properties of the commuter function between tent maps. In Section 3, we further investigate the range of the commuter functions. In Section 4, we discuss the implications these results have for the allowed and forbidden patterns of T_μ. Finally, in Section 5, we discuss a few conjectures.

2. Commuter Functions

Our stated goal is to study the relationship between the allowed patterns of two different tent maps. To shed some light on this question, we begin with a simpler one. When do two dynamical systems $f, g : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ have the same allowed patterns? This question is tantamount to asking that f and g have the "same" dynamics. Put more precisely, in order for two dynamical systems $f, g : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ to have the same allowed patterns, it is necessary that they are *conjugate*, meaning there is a homeomorphism $h : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ such that

$$f = h^{-1} \circ g \circ h.$$

Since we are dealing with maps on the unit interval, any such homeomorphism h must be continuous and either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing. It is straightforward to show that if h is strictly increasing (i.e., it is an order-preserving conjugacy), then f and g have the same allowed patterns.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $f, g : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ be two dynamical systems, and suppose there is a strictly increasing surjection $h : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ satisfying $f = h^{-1} \circ g \circ h$. Then* $\text{Allow}(f) = \text{Allow}(g)$.

Proof. Let $\pi \in \text{Allow}(f)$ be a pattern of length n, and choose $x \in [0,1]$ such that $\text{Pat}(x, f, n) = \pi$. That is,

$$x, f(x), f^2(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x)$$

is in the same relative order as $\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_n$. Since h is strictly increasing,

$$h(x), h(f(x)), h(f^2(x)), \ldots, h(f^{n-1}(x)) \tag{2}$$

is also in the same relative order. But we have $h \circ f = g \circ h$ by assumption, so the points in (2) can be rewritten as

$$h(x), g(h(x)), g^2(h(x)), \ldots, g^{n-1}(h(x)).$$

This means that $\pi = \text{Pat}(h(x), g, n)$, so $\pi \in \text{Allow}(g)$. Hence $\text{Allow}(f) \subseteq \text{Allow}(g)$. The same argument shows that if $\pi \in \text{Allow}(g)$ is realized at a point $x \in [0,1]$, then π is realized by f at $h^{-1}(x)$. Thus $\text{Allow}(f) = \text{Allow}(g)$. □

Unfortunately, T_μ and T are not conjugate if $\mu \neq 1$. (An easy way to see this is that the two maps have different topological entropies.) Therefore, we replace the notion of conjugacy with the commutation relation defined in the introduction, and seek a function $h_\mu : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ satisfying

$$T \circ h_\mu = h_\mu \circ T_\mu.$$

Definition 2.2. Let $f, g : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ be dynamical systems. We say that a function $h : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is a *commuter* for f and g if

$$f \circ h = h \circ g.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, commuters have been studied in [16]. The authors also exploit the commutation relation to build conjugacies that are otherwise hard to write down. For example, they present an iterative process for constructing a conjugacy between a skew tent map and a symmetric one. It has been observed in [18] and [14] that a similar procedure can be used to construct commuters between non-conjugate dynamical systems in special cases.

In general, we can say something about the relationship between the set of allowed patterns of two maps f and g if there is a commuter which is order-preserving (i.e. increasing, when f and g are maps on the unit interval).

Theorem 2.3. *Let $f, g : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ be two dynamical systems, and suppose there is a strictly increasing function $h : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ satisfying $f \circ h = h \circ g$. Then* $\text{Allow}_n(g) \subseteq \text{Allow}_n(f)$ *for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. The argument is the same as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Suppose $\pi \in \text{Allow}_n(g)$ for some n, and that π is realized by g at x. In other words,

$$x, g(x), g^2(x), \ldots, g^{n-1}(x)$$

is in the same relative order as

$$\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_n.$$

Since the commuter h is strictly increasing on the unit interval, it is order-preserving, so

$$h(x), h(g(x)), h(g^2(x)), \ldots, h(g^{n-1}(x)) \tag{3}$$

is in the same relative order as the entries of π. But we know that $h(g^k(x)) = f^k(h(x))$ for all k, so (3) is just the pattern of f at $h(x)$:

$$h(x), f(h(x)), f^2(h(x)), \ldots, f^{n-1}(h(x)).$$

Thus π is realized by f at $h(x)$, so $\pi \in \text{Allow}(f)$. □

In our setting, we would like to find a function h_μ satisfying the commutation relation with $f = T$ and $g = T_\mu$ for a given value of μ. To do so, we modify the construction from Section II.B of [16]. The details are more or less the same, but we still attempt to provide a self-contained treatment of the construction. Note first that the commutation relation (1) just says that

$$T(h_\mu(x)) = h_\mu(T_\mu(x))$$

for all $x \in [0,1]$. If $x \in [0, 1/2]$, this equation becomes

$$T(h_\mu(x)) = h_\mu(2\mu x), \tag{4}$$

while for $x \in (1/2, 1]$ we have

$$T(h_\mu(x)) = h_\mu(2\mu(1-x)). \tag{5}$$

Even though h_μ is not a conjugacy, it should preserve the monotone intervals of T and T_μ if it is to give us any meaningful information about the dynamics and allowed patterns. Therefore, we require that $h_\mu([0,1/2]) \subseteq [0,1/2]$ and $h_\mu((1/2,1]) \subseteq (1/2,1]$. Under this assumption, (4) becomes

$$2h_\mu(x) = h_\mu(2\mu x),$$

or

$$h_\mu(x) = \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu x).$$

On the other hand, (5) yields

$$2(1 - h_\mu(x)) = h_\mu(2\mu(1-x))$$

or

$$h_\mu(x) = 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu(1-x)).$$

Therefore, h_μ is a commuter if it satisfies the functional equation

$$h_\mu(x) = \begin{cases} \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu x) & \text{if } 0 \le x \le 1/2 \\ 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu(1-x)) & \text{if } 1/2 < x \le 1 \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

To show that such a function exists, we invoke the Contraction Mapping Theorem. Let $\mathcal{X} = B([0,1], \mathbf{R})$ denote the space of bounded real-valued functions on $[0,1]$, which is a complete metric space under the norm $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |f(x)|$. Define an operator $M_\mu : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ by

$$M_\mu f(x) = \begin{cases} \tfrac{1}{2} f(2\mu x) & \text{if } 0 \le x \le 1/2 \\ 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} f(2\mu(1-x)) & \text{if } 1/2 < x \le 1 \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Note that h_μ is a solution to (6) precisely when it is a fixed point of M_μ. Since h_μ should map the unit interval to itself, we are particularly interested in the restriction of M_μ to the closed subset

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in \mathcal{X} \mid f : [0,1] \to [0,1]\}.$$

Lemma 2.4. *The operator M_μ maps $\mathcal{F}$ to itself. In particular, if $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $M_\mu f$ maps $[0,1/2]$ to $[0,1/2]$ and $(1/2,1]$ to $[1/2,1]$.*

Proof. Suppose $f \in \mathcal{F}$. If $x \in [0,1/2]$, then

$$M_\mu f(x) = \tfrac{1}{2} f(2\mu x),$$

which belongs to $[0,1/2]$ since $0 \le f(2\mu x) \le 1$. Thus $M_\mu f$ maps $[0,1/2]$ to $[0,1/2]$. Similarly, if $x \in (1/2,1]$, then

$$M_\mu f(x) = 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} f(2\mu(1-x))$$

belongs to $[1/2,1]$. Consequently, $M_\mu f \in \mathcal{F}$. □

Lemma 2.5. *The operator M_μ is contractive on $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x\in[0,\frac{1}{2}]} |M_\mu f(x) - M_\mu g(x)| &= \sup_{x\in[0,\frac{1}{2}]} \left|\tfrac{1}{2} f(2\mu x) - \tfrac{1}{2} g(2\mu x)\right| \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \sup_{x\in[0,\frac{1}{2}]} |f(2\mu x) - g(2\mu x)| \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \sup_{x\in[0,\mu]} |f(x) - g(x)| \\
&\le \tfrac{1}{2} \sup_{x\in[0,1]} |f(x) - g(x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x\in(\frac{1}{2},1]} |M_\mu f(x) - M_\mu g(x)| &= \sup_{x\in(\frac{1}{2},1]} \left|(1 - \tfrac{1}{2} f(2\mu(1-x))) - (1 - \tfrac{1}{2} g(2\mu(1-x)))\right| \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \sup_{x\in(\frac{1}{2},1]} |g(2\mu(1-x)) - f(2\mu(1-x))| \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \sup_{x\in[0,\mu)} |g(x) - f(x)| \\
&\le \tfrac{1}{2} \sup_{x\in[0,1]} |f(x) - g(x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|M_\mu f - M_\mu g\|_\infty \le \frac{1}{2}\|f - g\|_\infty$ for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, so M_μ is contractive. □

Since $\mathcal{F}$ is complete and M_μ is a contraction, the Contraction Mapping Theorem guarantees that M_μ has a unique fixed point $h_\mu \in \mathcal{F}$. But we have already observed that a fixed point for M_μ satisfies the functional equation (6), and hence is the desired commuter. To summarize:

Theorem 2.6. *The fixed point h_μ of the contraction M_μ satisfies the commutation relation $T \circ h_\mu = h_\mu \circ T_\mu$.*

Remark 2.7. While h_μ is the unique fixed point of the contraction M_μ (hence the unique solution to the functional equation (6)), there are other commuters for the maps T and T_μ. We could have instead defined a contraction $M'_\mu : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ by

$$M'_\mu f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} f(2\mu x) & \text{if } 0 \le x < 1/2 \\ 1 - \frac{1}{2} f(2\mu(1-x)) & \text{if } 1/2 \le x \le 1, \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to requiring that the commuter maps $[0, 1/2)$ to $[0, 1/2)$ and $[1/2, 1]$ to $[1/2, 1]$. This contraction yields a different commuter h'_μ, though it agrees with h_μ everywhere except the points of discontinuity.

Remark 2.8. There is an extra advantage to our use of the Contraction Mapping Theorem. Since its proof is constructive, we obtain an iterative process for defining the fixed point h_μ. If we start with any function $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ and define the sequence of functions

$$f_n = M_\mu f_{n-1},$$

then $f_n \to h_\mu$ uniformly. That is, we can define

$$h_\mu = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n.$$

It is often useful to take either $f_0(x) = x$ or $f_0(x) = 1/2$. This construction also gives us an estimate for the speed of convergence. If $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\|f_0 - h_\mu\|_\infty \le 1$. Therefore,

$$\|f_1 - h_\mu\|_\infty = \|M_\mu f_0 - M_\mu h_\mu\|_\infty \le \tfrac{1}{2}\|f_0 - h_\mu\| \le \tfrac{1}{2}.$$

Continuing inductively, we find that

$$\|f_n - h_\mu\|_\infty \le \tfrac{1}{2^n}$$

for each n.

Example 2.9. Take $\mu = 3/4$. Then the commuter $h_{3/4}$ is depicted below.



FIGURE 2. The commuter $h_{3/4}$. Notice that the function is highly discontinuous, and its range has the appearance of a Cantor set. However, it does appear to be increasing.

Our ultimate goal is to prove that $\text{Allow}(T_\mu) \subseteq \text{Allow}(T)$ for all $\mu > 1/2$. To do this, we need to know that h_μ is order-preserving. Therefore, we now set about proving that h_μ is always strictly increasing for $\mu > 1/2$. We first develop some useful properties and then tackle the main proof.

Lemma 2.10. *The function $h_\mu : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is monotone increasing.*

Proof. We begin by setting $f_0(x) = x$ and $f_{n+1}(x) = M_\mu f_n(x)$. We show by induction that each f_n is strictly increasing, so $h_\mu = \lim f_n$ is, at the very least, monotone increasing.

Certainly f_0 is strictly increasing. Suppose then that f_{n-1} is strictly increasing. To show that f_n is strictly increasing, we need to consider three cases.

- If $x < y \leq 1/2$, then we have
$$f_n(x) = \tfrac{1}{2} f_{n-1}(2\mu x), \quad f_n(y) = \tfrac{1}{2} f_{n-1}(2\mu y).$$
But $2\mu x < 2\mu y$, so $f_{n-1}(2\mu x) < f_{n-1}(2\mu y)$. Thus $f_n(x) < f_n(y)$.
- If $1/2 < x < y$, then we have
$$f_n(x) = 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} f_{n-1}(2\mu(1-x))$$
and
$$f_n(y) = 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} f_{n-1}(2\mu(1-y)).$$
Since $1 - y < 1 - x$, $f_{n-1}(2\mu(1-y)) < f_{n-1}(2\mu(1-x))$, so $f_n(x) < f_n(y)$.
- Suppose $x \leq 1/2 < y$. We have already established the fact that each f_n maps $[0, 1/2]$ to $[0, 1/2]$ and $(1/2, 1]$ to $[1/2, 1]$. Thus we at least have $f_n(x) \leq 1/2 \leq f_n(y)$. Since $y > 1/2$, $2\mu(1-y) < \mu$, so $f_{n-1}(2\mu(1-y)) < f_{n-1}(\mu) \leq 1$. Therefore,
$$f_n(y) > 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} f_{n-1}(\mu) \geq \tfrac{1}{2},$$
so we indeed have $f_n(x) < f_n(y)$.

Therefore, each f_n is strictly increasing. Since $h_\mu = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n$ is a uniform limit of increasing functions, it is increasing, and we are done. □

Lemma 2.11. *If $\mu \in (0, 1]$, we have $h_\mu(0) = 0$ and $h_\mu(1) = 1$.*

Proof. We simply need to notice that
$$h_\mu(0) = \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu \cdot 0) = \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(0),$$
which forces $h_\mu(0) = 0$. As a result,
$$h_\mu(1) = 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu(1-1)) = 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(0) = 1.$$ □

Lemma 2.12. *If $1/2 < \mu < 1$, then $h_\mu(\mu) \neq 1$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $h_\mu(\mu) = 1$. Then
$$1 = h_\mu(\mu) = 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu(1-\mu)),$$
so $h_\mu(2\mu(1-\mu)) = 0$. Also, we have
$$h_\mu(\tfrac{1}{2}) = \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu \cdot \tfrac{1}{2}) = \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(\mu) = \tfrac{1}{2}$$
and
$$h_\mu(\tfrac{1}{4\mu}) = \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(2\mu \cdot \tfrac{1}{4\mu}) = \tfrac{1}{2} h_\mu(\tfrac{1}{2}) = \tfrac{1}{4}.$$
Continuing, we see that
$$h_\mu(\tfrac{1}{2^n \mu^{n-1}}) = \tfrac{1}{2^n}$$

in general. Choose n sufficiently large to ensure that

$$0 < \frac{1}{2^n \mu^{n-1}} < 2\mu(1-\mu).$$

Then

$$0 = h_\mu(0) < h_\mu(\tfrac{1}{2^n\mu^{n-1}}) > h_\mu(2\mu(1-\mu)) = 0,$$

contradicting the fact that h_μ is monotone increasing. Therefore, we must have $h_\mu(\mu) \neq 1$. □

Lemma 2.13. *If $1/2 < \mu < 1$, then h_μ has a jump discontinuity at $x = 1/2$.*

Proof. Put $a = h_\mu(\frac{1}{2})$. Since h_μ is increasing,

$$\lim_{x \to \frac{1}{2}^-} h_\mu(x) \leq a.$$

The functional equation then implies that

$$\lim_{x \to \frac{1}{2}^+} h_\mu(x) = 1 - a.$$

Thus h_μ is continuous at $x = 1/2$ if and only if $a = 1/2$. But if $h_\mu(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$h_\mu(\mu) = h_\mu(2\mu \cdot \tfrac{1}{2}) = 2h_\mu(\tfrac{1}{2}) = 1,$$

which is impossible by Lemma 2.12. Thus h_μ is discontinuous at $x = 1/2$. □

The next lemma shows that h_μ has jump discontinuities corresponding to the peaks of all the iterates of T_μ. More precisely, we claim that h_μ is discontinuous at any point where T_μ^n attains a local maximum for some n. Since T_μ^n is piecewise monotone (indeed, piecewise linear), the local extrema occur precisely at the points where T_μ^n is not differentiable. These are exactly the points x_0 for which $T_\mu^{n-1}(x_0) = 1/2$ or T_μ^{n-1} is not differentiable at x_0. Inductively, these points are just the preimages of $1/2$ under the maps $T_\mu^0, T_\mu, T_\mu^2, \ldots, T_\mu^{n-1}$.

Lemma 2.14. *Suppose $1/2 < \mu < 1$, and let $x_0 \in [0,1]$. If there exists $n \geq 0$ such that $T_\mu^n(x_0) = 1/2$, then h_μ is discontinuous at x_0.*

Proof. Let n be an integer for which $T_\mu^n(x_0) = 1/2$. Note first that

$$T^n(h_\mu(x_0)) = h_\mu(T_\mu^n(x_0)) = h_\mu(\tfrac{1}{2}).$$

Now observe that

$$T^n\Big(\lim_{x \to x_0^-} h_\mu(x)\Big) = \lim_{x \to x_0^-} T^n(h_\mu(x)) = \lim_{x \to x_0^-} h_\mu(T_\mu^n(x)) = \lim_{x \to \frac{1}{2}^-} h_\mu(x),$$

and similarly,

$$T^n\Big(\lim_{x \to x_0^+} h_\mu(x)\Big) = \lim_{x \to x_0^+} T^n(h_\mu(x)) = \lim_{x \to x_0^+} h_\mu(T_\mu^n(x)) = \lim_{x \to \frac{1}{2}^+} h_\mu(x).$$

Since h_μ has a jump discontinuity at $1/2$, it follows that

$$\lim_{x \to x_0^-} h_\mu(x) \neq \lim_{x \to x_0^+} h_\mu(x).$$

Thus h_μ has a jump discontinuity at x_0. □

Lemma 2.15. *If $x, y \in [0,1]$ with $x < y$, then there exists $x < x_0 < y$ such that $T_\mu^n(x_0) = 1/2$ for some $n \geq 0$.*

Proof. Put $\delta = |x - y|$. Assume first that $x < y \leq 1/2$. Since T_μ is continuous and strictly increasing on $[0, 1/2]$, $T_\mu((x, y)) = (2\mu x, 2\mu y)$. Similarly, if $1/2 < x < y$, then $T_\mu((x, y)) = (2\mu(1 - y), 2\mu(1 - x))$. In either case, T_μ stretches (x, y) by a factor of 2μ (since $\mu > 1/2$). If $T_\mu((x, y))$ is contained entirely within either $[0, 1/2]$ or $[1/2, 1]$, apply T_μ again, which stretches the interval by another factor of 2μ. Repeat until $1/2 \in T_\mu^n((x, y))$. This process is guaranteed to terminate before $n = \lceil -\log(2\delta)/\log(2\mu) \rceil$. Indeed, if $1/2 \notin T_\mu^k((x, y))$ for $k < n = \lceil -\log(2\delta)/\log(2\mu) \rceil$, then $T_\mu^n((x, y))$ is guaranteed to have length

$$(2\mu)^n \delta > (2\mu)^{-\log(2\delta)/\log(2\mu)} \delta = e^{-\log(2\delta)} \delta = \tfrac{1}{2},$$

which forces $1/2 \in T_\mu^n((x, y))$. Thus there exists $x_0 \in (x, y)$ such that $T_\mu^n(x_0) = 1/2$ for some $n \geq 1$. □

Corollary 2.16. *Given two points $x, y \in [0, 1]$ with $x < y$, there exists $x_0 \in (x, y)$ such that h_μ is discontinuous at x_0.*

Proof. We have just shown in Lemma 2.15 that between any two points $x, y \in [0, 1]$, we can find a point $x_0 \in (x, y)$ such that $T_\mu^n(x_0) = 1/2$ for some n. But we have also shown in Lemma 2.14 that h_μ has a jump discontinuity at any such point. □

Theorem 2.17. *The function h_μ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in [0, 1]$ with $x < y$. By Corollary 2.16, there is a point x_0 between x and y at which h_μ has a jump discontinuity. Since h_μ is increasing, we have

$$h_\mu(x) \leq \lim_{t \to x_0^-} h_\mu(t) < \lim_{t \to x_0^+} h_\mu(t) \leq h_\mu(y),$$

so h_μ is indeed strictly increasing. □

We close this section with a useful result about the family $\{h_\mu\}$ of commuters for $1/2 < \mu < 1$. One would expect that the functions h_μ should approach the identity function $h(x) = x$ as $\mu \to 1$, at least pointwise. In fact, we prove that $h_\mu \to h$ *uniformly* as $\mu \to 1$.

Recall that we established the existence of h_μ by defining it to be the unique fixed point of the contraction $M_\mu : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}$. Not only is each M_μ contractive, but the one-parameter family $\{M_\mu\}_{\frac{1}{2} < \mu < 1}$ is *uniformly contractive* in the sense that

$$\|M_\mu f - M_\mu g\|_\infty \leq \alpha \|f - g\|_\infty$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, where α is a constant that is independent of μ. In particular, we can take $\alpha = 1/2$. Also, notice that for $\mu = 1$ the contraction $M := M_1$ takes the form

$$Mf(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} f(2x) & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 1/2 \\ 1 - \frac{1}{2} f(2(1 - x)) & \text{if } 1/2 < x \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

and the identity function $h(x) = x$ is the unique fixed point of M. With these facts in hand, we are now in a position to invoke the Uniform Contraction Principle of [17] to see that $h_\mu \to h$ uniformly.

Theorem 2.18. *As $\mu \to 1$, the one-parameter family $\{h_\mu\}$ converges uniformly to the identity function $h : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$.*

Proof. We have already seen that the family $\{M_\mu\}_{\frac{1}{2}<\mu\leq 1}$ is uniformly contractive with contraction constant $\alpha = 1/2$. Now we claim that for each μ,

$$\|M_\mu h - h\| \leq \frac{1-\mu}{2}.$$

If $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, then

$$|M_\mu h(x) - h(x)| = \left|\tfrac{1}{2}h(2\mu x) - h(x)\right| = \left|\tfrac{1}{2}\cdot 2\mu x - x\right| = |(\mu-1)x| \leq \frac{1-\mu}{2}.$$

Likewise, if $x \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |M_\mu h(x) - h(x)| &= \left|1 - \tfrac{1}{2}h(2\mu(1-x)) - h(x)\right| \\ &= |1 - \mu + \mu x - x| \\ &= |(1-\mu)(1-x)| \\ &\leq \frac{1-\mu}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The Uniform Contraction Principle [17, Theorem C.5] now guarantees that

$$\|h_\mu - h\|_\infty \leq \frac{1-\mu}{2}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2}} = 1-\mu.$$

From this it is clear that $h_\mu \to h$ uniformly as $\mu \to 1$. □

3. The Range of h_μ

It is particularly interesting to study the range of the map h_μ since we can see from the proof of Theorem 2.3 that the allowed permutations realized by the map T_μ are exactly

$$\{\pi \mid \pi = \mathrm{Pat}(x, T, n\} \text{ for } x \in \mathrm{Range}(h_\mu)\} \subseteq \mathrm{Allow}_n(T).$$

Based on the pictures above, it appears that the range of h_μ is a Cantor-like set. In particular, it looks as though the gap at $x = 1/2$ is replicated at smaller and smaller scales throughout the range of h_μ. Indeed, we have already seen that this jump discontinuity is replicated at precisely the points where the peaks of the iterates of T_μ occur. We aim to show here that the gaps in the range consist of a union of intervals centered at dyadic rationals, each with radius proportional to that of the gap at $x = 1/2$.

We begin by observing that the range of h_μ must exclude any point y for which $T(y) > h_\mu(\mu)$. This is due to the commutation relationship

$$h_\mu \circ T_\mu = T \circ h_\mu.$$

Since the maximum of T_μ is μ, the possible values of the left side are at most $h_\mu(\mu)$. The standard tent map T takes values greater than $h_\mu(\mu)$ whenever x is between $h_\mu(\mu)/2$ and $1 - h_\mu(\mu)/2$, so the interval

$$\left(\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2}, 1 - \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2}\right)$$

is omitted from the range of h_μ. We also have

$$h_\mu \circ T_\mu^2 = T^2 \circ h_\mu,$$

so h_μ can never take values in the set $(T^2)^{-1}((h_\mu(\mu), 1])$. Thus

$$\left(\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{4}, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{4}\right) \cup \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{4}, 1 - \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{4}\right)$$

is excluded from the range of h_μ. In general, h_μ cannot take values that would make T^n greater than $h_\mu(\mu)$. We prove below that this occurs on the set

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}} \left(\frac{2i-1}{2^n} - \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}, \frac{2i-1}{2^n} + \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}\right).$$

Proposition 3.1. *The set*

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}} \left(\frac{2i-1}{2^n} - \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}, \frac{2i-1}{2^n} + \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}\right)$$

does not belong to the range of h_μ.

Proof. First recall that for each $n \geq 1$, the peaks of T^n (i.e., the points where $T^n(x) = 1$) occur at the dyadic points $x = \frac{2i-1}{2^n}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$. On the interval $[0, \frac{1}{2^n}]$ we have

$$T^n(x) = 2^n x,$$

so $T^n(x) > h_\mu(\mu)$ when $\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n} < x \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$. Similarly, on the interval $[\frac{1}{2^n}, \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}]$

$$T^n(x) = 2^n(\tfrac{1}{2^{n-1}} - x),$$

so $T^n(x) > h_\mu(\mu)$ when $\frac{1}{2^n} \leq x < \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}$. Therefore, $T^n(x) > h_\mu(\mu)$ for all x in the interval

$$\left(\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}, \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}\right).$$

This interval is symmetric about $\frac{1}{2^n}$, which we can make more evident by rewriting it as

$$\left(\frac{1}{2^n} - \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}, \frac{1}{2^n} + \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}\right).$$

We can obtain the intervals around the other peaks by simply translating. That is, we have $T^n(x) > h_\mu(\mu)$ for all x in the intervals

$$\left(\frac{2i-1}{2^n} - \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}, \frac{2i-1}{2^n} + \frac{1-h_\mu(\mu)}{2^n}\right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}.$$

Thus none of these intervals can belong to the range of h_μ. Taking the union over $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$ and over all $n \geq 1$ yields the desired result. □

4. Allowed and Forbidden Patterns

Here, we study the relationship between the allowed and forbidden patterns of T_μ and T, starting with the following theorem which tells us that any pattern realized by T_μ for $1/2 < \mu \leq 1$ must also be realized by T.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose $\pi \in \text{Allow}(T_\mu)$, where $1/2 < \mu \leq 1$. Then $\pi \in \text{Allow}(T)$.*

Proof. Since h_μ is increasing by Theorem 2.17, we could take $f = T$, $g = T_\mu$ and $h = h_\mu$ in Theorem 2.3. The result follows. □

Now we set out to investigate the length of the shortest pattern allowed for the full tent map T but forbidden for T_μ. This requires us to more closely analyze the behavior of T and its iterates near $x = 1/2$. Consequently, we show that the pattern of length n realized at points near $1/2$ always has a very particular form. Moreover, this pattern can only occur near $1/2$.

Proposition 4.2. *Fix $n \geq 3$. Then for all $x \in \left(\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}, \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}\right)\backslash\{\frac{1}{2}\}$,*

$$\mathrm{Pat}(x, T, n) = (n-1)n123\cdots(n-2).$$

Proof. First notice that if $m \geq 2$, then $T^m(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$. Also, T^m is a piecewise linear function with slope $\pm 2^m$. Thus the monotone segment of T^m to the left of $x = 1/2$ is

$$y = -2^m\left(x - \tfrac{1}{2}\right), \quad \tfrac{2^{m-1}-1}{2^m} \leq x \leq \tfrac{1}{2}, \tag{8}$$

while the segment to the right is

$$y = 2^m\left(x - \tfrac{1}{2}\right), \quad \tfrac{1}{2} \leq x \leq \tfrac{2^{m-1}+1}{2^m}. \tag{9}$$

It follows that for all $x \in \left(\frac{2^{n-2}-1}{2^{n-1}}, \frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}}\right)\backslash\{\frac{1}{2}\}$,

$$T^2(x) < T^3(x) < \cdots < T^{n-1}(x).$$

To finish the proof, it suffices to find a (possibly smaller) interval on which

$$T^{n-1}(x) < x < T(x).$$

Note first that $x < T(x)$ for all $x \in (0, \frac{2}{3})$. Now, simply set (8) and (9) equal to x (taking $m = n-1$) and solve. This yields

$$x = \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}, \ \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}.$$

Notice that $\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1} < \frac{2}{3}$ for all $n \geq 3$. Thus for all $x \in \left(\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}, \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}\right)\backslash\{\frac{1}{2}\}$, we have

$$T^2(x) < T^3(x) < \cdots < T^{n-1}(x) < x < T(x),$$

so $\mathrm{Pat}(x, T, n) = (n-1)n123\cdots(n-2)$. □

Proposition 4.3. *The pattern $(n-1)n123\cdots(n-2)$ is realized nowhere else.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n. Notice first that the pattern $\sigma_3 = 231$ is realized only on the interval $(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{2}{3})$. Assume $\sigma_{n-1} = (n-2)(n-1)123\cdots(n-3)$ is realized only on the interval $\left(\frac{2^{n-3}}{2^{n-2}+1}, \frac{2^{n-3}}{2^{n-2}-1}\right)$. Then σ_n cannot occur outside this interval, since the first $n-1$ terms of σ_n are in the same relative order as σ_{n-1}. As stated in the proof of Proposition 4.2, $T^{n-1}(x) = x$ at the points $\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}$ and $\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}$, and $T^{n-1}(x) < x$ when x lies between these points. By (8), T^{n-1} is linear on the interval $\left(\frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, therefore $x < T^{n-1}(x)$ when $x \in \left(\frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}}, \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}\right)$. Likewise, it follows from (9) that $x < T^{n-1}(x)$ when $x \in \left(\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}, \frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}}\right)$. Thus σ_n cannot be realized on $\left(\frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}}, \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}\right)$ or $\left(\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}, \frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}}\right)$. It is straightforward to check that

$$\frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}} < \frac{2^{n-3}}{2^{n-2}+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2^{n-3}}{2^{n-2}-1} < \frac{2^{n-2}+1}{2^{n-1}},$$

so it follows that the only points of $\left(\frac{2^{n-3}}{2^{n-2}+1}, \frac{2^{n-3}}{2^{n-2}-1}\right)$ satisfying $x < T^{n-1}(x)$ lie in the smaller interval $\left(\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}, \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}\right)$. Therefore, σ_n is realized only on this interval. □

Thanks to Proposition 3.1, we know many values that are omitted from the range of h_μ when $1/2 < \mu < 1$. We can use this information to determine conditions for when T_μ avoids the pattern $\sigma_n = (n-1)n123\cdots(n-2)$ from the previous two propositions.

Corollary 4.4. *If*

$$h_\mu(\mu) < 2\left(1 - \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}\right),$$

then T_μ avoids the pattern $\sigma_n = (n-1)n123\cdots(n-2)$.

Proof. We already know that the range of h omits the interval

$$\left(\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2}, 1 - \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2}\right)$$

and that σ_n is only realized on the interval $\left(\frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1}, \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}\right)\backslash\{\frac{1}{2}\}$. In light of this, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2} < \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2} > \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}.$$

The latter inequality is immediate from our hypothesis. We can get the first inequality from the second by simply reflecting over the line $x = 1/2$:

$$\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2} < 1 - \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1} = \frac{2^{n-1} - 2^{n-2} - 1}{2^{n-1}-1}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}(2^{n-1} - 2^{n-2} - 1)(2^{n-1}+1) &= 2^{2n-2} - 2^{2n-3} - 2^{n-2} - 1 \\ &= 2^{2n-3} - 2^{n-2} - 1 \\ &< 2^{2n-3} - 2^{n-2} \\ &= 2^{n-2}(2^{n-1} - 1),\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\frac{h_\mu(\mu)}{2} < \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}+1},$$

and we are done. □

Given the inherent mystery surrounding the functions h_μ, it would be nice if we could somehow obtain a bound involving μ itself that would guarantee T_μ avoids σ_n. To do so, we first need to relate $h_\mu(\mu)$ to μ. This involves a more careful implementation of the estimates in the proof of Theorem 2.18.

Proposition 4.5. *For all $\mu \in (1/2, 1]$, $|h_\mu(\mu) - \mu| \leq \frac{1}{2}(1-\mu) + (1-\mu)^2$.*

Proof. Notice first that

$$|h_\mu(x) - x| \leq |h_\mu(x) - M_\mu h(x)| + |M_\mu h(x) - x|$$

for all $x \in [0,1]$. Since each M_μ is a contraction with contraction constant $1/2$, we have

$$|h_\mu(x) - M_\mu h(x)| = |M_\mu h_\mu(x) - M_\mu h(x)| \leq \tfrac{1}{2}\|h_\mu - h\|_\infty \leq \tfrac{1}{2}(1-\mu).$$

Moreover, if $x \in (1/2, 1]$, we have

$$|M_\mu h(x) - x| = (1-\mu)(1-x)$$

from the proof of Theorem 2.18. It follows then that

$$|h_\mu(\mu) - \mu| \leq \tfrac{1}{2}(1-\mu) + (1-\mu)^2. \qquad \square$$

We can now couple this estimate with Corollary 4.4 to obtain a bound in terms of μ that guarantees the avoidance of certain patterns by T_μ.

Theorem 4.6. *Fix $n > 5$. If*

$$\mu < \frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{9 - \frac{2^{n+2}+8}{2^{n-1}-1}}, \tag{10}$$

then T_μ avoids the pattern $\sigma_n = (n-1)n123\cdots(n-2)$.

Proof. We know from Corollary 4.4 that σ_n is avoided by T_μ if

$$h_\mu(\mu) < 2\left(1 - \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^{n-1}-1}\right) = 2 - \frac{2^{n-1}}{2^{n-1}-1}.$$

But the previous proposition shows that $h_\mu(\mu) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1-\mu) + (1-\mu)^2 + \mu$, so

$$\tfrac{1}{2}(1-\mu) + (1-\mu)^2 + \mu < 2 - \frac{2^{n-1}}{2^{n-1}-1} \tag{11}$$

would guarantee that T_μ avoids σ_n. This inequality is equivalent to

$$\mu^2 - \frac{3}{2}\mu + \frac{2^{n-1}+1}{2^n - 2} < 0.$$

The roots of this quadratic are precisely

$$\mu = \frac{3}{4} \pm \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{9 - \frac{2^{n+2}+8}{2^{n-1}-1}},$$

which are real provided $n > 5$. Thus (11) is satisfied whenever

$$\frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{9 - \frac{2^{n+2}+8}{2^{n-1}-1}} < \mu < \frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{9 - \frac{2^{n+2}+8}{2^{n-1}-1}}.$$

The first term is always less than $1/2$, so we are simply left with (10). The result then follows. $\square$

Notice that this theorem implies that the inclusion $\mathrm{Allow}(T_\mu) \subseteq \mathrm{Allow}(T_1)$ in Theorem 4.1 is strict when $\mu < 1$. Indeed for any $\mu < 1$, there is a sufficiently large n so that Theorem 4.6 implies that T_μ avoids σ_n, while such patterns belong to $\mathrm{Allow}(T)$ for all n. As discussed in the next section, the patterns σ_n are of particular interest, as we conjecture that the smallest pattern allowed by T and avoided by T_μ is of the form σ_n for some n.

For small values of n, we can compute

$$\sup\{\mu : \sigma_n \notin \mathrm{Allow}(T_\mu)\}$$

exactly. We present these values for $4 \leq n \leq 12$ in Table 1, together with the upper bounds computed using Theorem 4.6. (We omit the case $n = 3$, since $\sigma_3 = 231$ is an allowed pattern of T_μ for $1/2 < \mu \leq 1$.)

n	$\mu_{n,a}$	$\mu_{n,e}$
4	0.809017	—
5	0.919643	—
6	0.963781	0.923902
7	0.982974	0.965933
8	0.991791	0.983722
9	0.995982	0.992030
10	0.998016	0.996055
11	0.999015	0.998037
12	0.999509	0.999021

TABLE 1. This table depicts the true and estimated upper bounds on μ (to six decimal places) that guarantee T_μ avoids σ_n for some specific values of n. Here $\mu_{n,a}$ is the true upper bound (i.e., T_μ avoids σ_n if and only if $\mu < \mu_{n,a}$) while $\mu_{n,e}$ is the upper bound afforded by Theorem 4.6.

5. Conjectures

We now state some conjectures related to this work. Given $\mu \in (1/2, 1)$, we define a pattern π to be *μ-forbidden* if $\pi \in \text{Allow}(T)$ but $\pi \notin \text{Allow}(T_\mu)$.

Our first conjecture is that the shortest pattern avoided by T_μ, but allowed by T, can always be taken to be of the form $\sigma_n = (n-1)n123\cdots(n-2)$. In other words, there may be other patterns of the same length that are μ-forbidden, but none shorter than the shortest σ_n that is μ-forbidden.

Conjecture 1. *For any $1/2 < \mu < 1$, the shortest μ-forbidden pattern is of the form*

$$\sigma_n = (n-1)n123\cdots(n-2).$$

That is, if n is the length of the shortest μ-forbidden pattern, then T_μ avoids σ_n.

In addition to numerical evidence, this conjecture is supported by the observation that the behavior of the iterates of T_μ differs the most from that of the iterates of T near $x = 1/2$ (as in Figure 1). Therefore, we expect the shortest μ-forbidden pattern to have the form $\text{Pat}(x, T, n)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and x in a sufficiently small neighborhood of $1/2$. But Proposition 4.2 shows that $\text{Pat}(x, T, n) = \sigma_n$ when x is close to $1/2$.

Our second conjecture involves the relationship between the allowed patterns of two tent maps T_μ and T_ν, where $\mu < \nu$. We already know that if $\nu = 1$, then

$$\text{Allow}(T_\mu) \subseteq \text{Allow}(T_\nu).$$

We would expect something like this to be true in general, though the iterative process for building commuters falls apart here. However, a closer analysis of the commuters h_μ and h_ν, together with Proposition 3.1, should yield a positive result.

Conjecture 2. *If $1/2 < \mu < \nu \leq 1$, then $h_\mu(\mu) < h_\nu(\nu)$. Consequently, the range of h_μ is contained in the range of h_ν, and we have*

$$\text{Allow}(T_\mu) \subsetneq \text{Allow}(T_\nu).$$

To obtain a positive resolution to this conjecture, it is necessary for one to show that $h_\mu(\mu)$ is increasing with μ. Numerical evidence suggests that this is the case (see Figure 3).

Finally, one would hope for a tighter bound than the one obtained in Proposition 4.5. Numerical evidence indicates that there is a better bound. However, we are unable to prove it at this time.

Conjecture 3. *The bound in Proposition 4.5 can be improved. In particular, for all $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ we have*

$$h_\mu(\mu) \leq \mu^2 + \tfrac{5}{4}(1-\mu).$$



FIGURE 3. (Left) A plot of $h_\mu(\mu)$ versus μ, for $1/2 < \mu \leq 1$, which supports Conjecture 2. (Right) A plot of $h_\mu(\mu)$ together with $\mu^2 + \frac{5}{4}(1-\mu)$ for $1/2 < \mu \leq 1$, which appears to corroborate Conjecture 3.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for helpful suggestions that improved the final version of the paper.

REFERENCES

1. J.M. Amigó, *The ordinal structure of the signed shift transformations*, Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos Appl. Sci. Engrg. (2009), no. 19, 3311–3327.
2. J.M. Amigó, S. Elizalde, and M. Kennel, *Forbidden patterns and shift systems*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **115** (2008), no. 3, 485–504.
3. J.M. Amigó, S. Zambrano, and M.A.F. Sanjuán, *True and false forbidden patterns in deterministic and random dynamics*, Europhys. Lett. **79** (2007), no. 50001.

4. ———, *Combinatorial detection of determinism in noisy time series*, Europhys. Lett. **83** (2008), no. 60005.
5. ———, *Detecting determinism in time series with ordinal patterns: a comparative study*, Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos Appl. Sci. Engrg. **20** (2010), no. 9, 2915–2924.
6. K. Archer, *Characterization of the allowed patterns of signed shifts*, Submitted. arXiv:1506.03464.
7. K. Archer and S. Elizalde, *Cyclic permutations realized by signed shifts*, J. Comb. **5** (2014), no. 1, 1–30.
8. C. Bandt, G. Keller, and B. Pompe, *Entropy of interval maps via permutations*, Nonlinearity **15** (2002), no. 5, 1595–1602.
9. S. Elizalde, *The number of permutations realized by a shift*, SIAM J. Discrete Math **23** (2009), 765–786.
10. ———, *Descent sets of cyclic permutations*, Adv. in Appl. Math. **47** (2011), no. 4, 688–709.
11. ———, *Permutations and beta-shifts*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **118** (2011), no. 8, 2474–2497.
12. S. Elizalde and Y. Liu, *On basic forbidden patterns of functions*, Discrete Appl. Math. **159** (2011), no. 12, 1207–1216.
13. S. Elizalde and K. Moore, *Patterns of negative shifts and beta-shifts*, arxiv:1512.04479.
14. Scott M. LaLonde, *A computational approach to measuring homeomorphic defect*, Master's thesis, Clarkson University, Potsdam, NY, May 2009.
15. M. Makarov, *On permutations generated by infinite binary words*, Sib. Elektron. Mat. Izv. **3** (2006), 304–311.
16. Joseph D. Skufca and Erik M. Bollt, *A concept of homeomorphic defect for defining mostly conjugate dynamical systems*, Chaos **18** (2008), no. 1.
17. Andrew Stuart and A. R. Humphries, *Dynamical systems and numerical analysis*, Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
18. Jiongxuan Zheng, Joseph D. Skufca, and Erik M. Bolt, *Regularity of commuter functions for homeomorphic defect measure in dynamical systems model comparison*, Dyn. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Syst. Ser. A Math. Anal. **18** (2011), no. 3, 363–382.